Appl. No. : 10/550,225 Filing date : August 2, 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1, 23, 43 and 44 have been amended. Thus, Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 18-27, 29 and 38-44 are presented for examination. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejection in view of the comments presented herein are respectfully requested.

<u>Interview Summary</u>

Applicants' representatives would like to thank Examiners Bobish and Kramer for the courtesy extended to them during the telephonic interview conducted on July 22, 2010. The substance of this interview is reflected in the amendments and remarks presented herein.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 18-27, 29 and 38-44 were rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sarshar et al. (WO 95/074414) in view of Wiltshire et al. (GB 2 239 676) in view of Cholet et al. (US 4,718,824) in view of Palmour (US 3,783,463) in view of Woerheide (US 5,390,740).

The present invention relates to a system and process for pumping multiphase fluids, and in particular for boosting the production of gas and oil from low pressure wells. The need for a production boosting system is described in detail in the introductory portion of the present specification. Applicants hereby incorporate by reference their arguments relating to the combination of Sarshar et al, Wiltshire et al., Cholet et al. and Palmour et al. set forth in the response filed February 23, 2010. The Examiner was apparently convinced by Applicants' arguments. However, the Examiner now cites Woerheide et al. for its teaching that the use of high pressure steam generated separately from well bore production is a known motive fluid for jet pumps in well systems. Claims 1, 23, 43 and 44 as amended no longer recite high pressure steam as a gas source. These claims as amended recite only lift gas, export gas and underground steam as gas sources, none of which are disclosed or suggested by Woerheide et al., or by any of the other cited references either alone or in combination.

During the interview, the Examiners inquired as to whether the terms lift gas, export gas and underground steam had well known meanings in the art. Lift gas is described in http://www.answers.com/topic/gas-lift-1 and www.ep-solutions.com/PDF/Articles/Pipeline 0704.pdf (Exhibits A and B, respectively). These articles

Appl. No. : 10/550,225 Filing date : August 2, 2006

show that "lift gas" would be understood by those skilled in the art as a gas used in connection with a system for injecting gas near the bottom of a well to lighten the column of oil.

Export gas is described in http://www.aaaoe.com/sell/297/296683/Export_LPG_gas_tanks_and_oil_and_petroleum_storage_container.html and http://www.pme[etrp.org/mslib/servlet/onepetropreview?id=OTC-16691-MS&soc+OTC (Exhibits C and D, respectively). These articles show that "export gas" would be understood by those skilled in the art as a gas that is exported from a well and delivered by a suitable system, such as a pipeline or in containers.

Underground steam is described in http://www.cf.missouri.edu/energy/em_utdist/index.html (Exhibits E and F, respectively). These articles show that "underground steam" would be understood by those skilled in the art as steam that is available underground either naturally or produced artificially and delivered through pipes.

Thus, the meaning of all three gas sources recited in the present claims would be well understood by one of ordinary skill in the art.

In view of the comments presented above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

No Disclaimers or Disavowals

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, Applicant is not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that Applicant has made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

Appl. No. : 10/550,225 Filing date : August 2, 2006

CONCLUSION

Should there be any questions concerning this application, the Examiner is invited to

contact the undersigned agent at the telephone number appearing below. Please charge any

additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to

Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: August 12, 2010 By: /Neil S. Bartfeld/

Neil S. Bartfeld, Ph.D. Registration No. 39,901 Agent of Record Customer No. 20,995

(619) 235-8550

9504596 081210

-11-